

LAW OFFICES

COHN AND MARKS

STANLEY S. NEUSTADT
RICHARD M. SCHMIDT, JR.
JOEL H. LEVY
ROBERT B. JACOBI
ROY R. RUSSO
RONALD A. SIEGEL
LAWRENCE N. COHN
RICHARD A. HELMICK
WAYNE COY, JR.

MARK L. PELESH
J. BRIAN DE BOICE
ALLAN ROBERT ADLER
CHARLES M. OLIVER

OF COUNSEL
MARCUS COHN
LEONARD H. MARKS
STANLEY B. COHEN

SUSAN V. SACHS
JOHN R. PRZYPYSZNY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

SUITE 600

**1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-1573**

TELEPHONE (202) 293-3860

TELECOPIER (202) 293-4827

DIRECT DIAL: (202) 452-4817

INTERNET ADDRESS:


May 17, 1995

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 222
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Mr. Caton

On behalf of Texas Television, Inc., there are herewith submitted an original and five (5) copies of its Comments in MM Docket No. 91-221.

Sincerely


Lawrence N. Cohn

Enclosures

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

25

RECEIVED

MAY 17 1995

BEFORE THE

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Federal Communications Commission

In the Matter of)
)
Review of the Commission's) MM Docket No. 91-221
Regulations Governing Television)
Broadcasting)

To: The Commission

COMMENTS

Texas Television, Inc. ("Texas"), which is the parent entity of the separate licensees of Television Stations KIII, Corpus Christi, Texas, KBMT, Beaumont, Texas, and KUSI-TV, San Diego, California, by its counsel, hereby submits its Comments in response to the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FCC 94-322) ("FNPRM") issued by the Commission on January 17, 1995, in the above-captioned proceeding. Texas' comments regarding the proposals to change the local ownership aspects of the Commission's multiple ownership rules are set forth below.

I. Summary

Texas' comments are primarily directed toward the issue raised in the FNPRM of whether, and if so under what circumstances, a single entity should be allowed to own, operate, or control (hereinafter referred to for purposes of simplicity as "own") more

than one television broadcast station in a single market (FNPRM, Paras. 116-123). On this issue, Texas believes that the Commission should change its rules to allow an entity to own a UHF/UHF combination of TV broadcast stations in the same market without any restriction.

However, in the event the Commission declines to change its rules in this manner, Texas proposes that the Commission allow such UHF/UHF joint ownership in circumstances where there are "substantial independent competing media" in the relevant market (as defined below). Finally, if the Commission determines that it will not allow joint ownership of UHF/UHF television stations in a market, Texas supports the Commission's proposal (advanced in the FNPRM) to utilize the Grade A contours of television broadcast stations to determine whether television stations are sufficiently close to be of concern for purposes of local concentration of control purposes.

On a separate subject, Texas supports the Commission's proposal to treat television LMA's similar to the way it treats radio LMA's; however, it believes that television LMA's entered prior to the effective date of the adoption of the television LMA rules, not merely those entered before the FNPRM was adopted, should be given "grandfathered" status.

Texas also believes that the Commission should eliminate its current one-to-a-market rule which generally prohibits radio/television station combinations. Texas believes that elimination of this rule, and reliance on the local radio and local television ownership rules, would greatly promote news carriage by radio stations and, in particular, the creation of all-news stations in middle or smaller markets where this format is otherwise not economically feasible. Accordingly, the elimination of the radio/television station prohibition would serve the public interest.

II. The Commission Should Eliminate the Television "One-to-a-Market" Rule Insofar As It Pertains to UHF/UHF Combinations.

Texas' views flow from its fundamental belief that in many situations, if the Commission were to allow entities to own more than one television broadcast station in a market, it would ultimately have favorable public interest ramifications because of the savings which would be realized by the joint operation of the stations. This principle is not in dispute; indeed, the Commission recognized forcefulness of this point in the FNPRM when it wrote the following (at Para. 107):

joint ownership of stations in the same market permits cost-sharing in administrative and overhead expenses, sharing of personnel, joint advertising

sales, and the pooling of resources for local program production (such as news and public affairs programming). We believe the cost savings from these economies could then be used to provide better programming to the public.

Thus, comments such as these, which urge the relaxation of the Commission's multiple ownership regulations, must not be treated as merely self-serving statements, but should be favorably considered by the Commission because relaxation of the multiple ownership restrictions would affirmatively serve the public interest by promoting efficiency and making funds available for additional news, public affairs, and other public service programming.

Texas believes that the weight of experience in analogous situations has shown the value of such joint television operations. Specifically, combinations of two television stations under Local Marketing Agreements (or "LMA's"), which are currently not the subject of Commission regulation, have allowed several stations which were either off the air or operating under extremely restricted financial circumstances, to become economically viable and to thereby enhance the diversity of programming available in their markets. Indeed, local news and local issue-oriented programming which may have been totally absent or available only in limited amounts, are more likely to increase under dual ownership. Similarly, the Commission's experience with the waiver of the

radio/television cross-ownership prohibition in the context of "failed stations" and stations in the top 25 markets with 30 or more independent broadcast voices^{1/} shows that such combinations can, and often do, result in an increase in programming diversity. Therefore, Texas believes that the weight of experience strongly suggests that the complete elimination of the television overlap rule, insofar as it applies to UHF-UHF combinations, would promote the public interest. The public interest would best be served by reliance on the anti-trust laws to stop combinations which are likely to have significant anti-competitive ramifications.

One further point is important. The Commission's records are replete with examples of bankrupt UHF stations, UHF stations sold for very small sum because of their precarious financial positions, and even UHF station construction permits and licenses returned to the Commission. Allowing UHF/UHF station combinations would help keep struggling UHF stations on the air.

However, Texas appreciates the Commission's concern that entities not be allowed to create a television station combination in a market where that combination would significantly detract from economic competition and diversity of programming viewpoint. Texas

^{1/} See Section 73.3555, Note 7.

believes that if the Commission is determined to retain any restrictions on such combinations, it should not adopt a single rule which is designed to be applicable in all situations, and which would treat all markets as though they were the same or similar. The flaw in such an approach is that it fails to recognize the fundamentally important point that while in some (smaller) markets the combination of two TV broadcast stations might conceivably have an adverse impact on economic competition and viewpoint diversity, in other (larger) markets the effects of the same television broadcast station combination would be almost certainly minimal (at most). Any restrictive rules adopted by the Commission in this proceeding must recognize that one size does not fit all, and should take into account that at least in some situations, it is a virtual certainty that a combination of UHF television broadcast stations in a market would provide major benefits to the public which would outweigh any negative consequences which might result from any slight reduction of economic competition and viewpoint diversity.

Accordingly, Texas believes that if the Commission is unwilling to allow all UHF/UHF combinations without restriction, it should adopt television cross-ownership rules which vary from market to market, and which allow a single entity to own any

UHF/UHF combination if the applicant is able to demonstrate to the Commission's satisfaction that, apart from the stations proposed for joint ownership,^{2/} there are a substantial number of other "independent competing media" in the market. For these purposes, Texas proposes that the following be considered as "competing media."^{3/}

1) Other TV broadcast stations in the DMA (excluding the ones which are the subject of the proposed combination). For this purpose, the Commission would consider all full-power television broadcast stations located in the A.C. Neilson Designated Market Area ("DMA") of the stations (or either of them if they are in different DMA's) which are the subject of the proposed combination.

2) Other TV broadcast stations which are "significantly viewed" in the local market. For this purpose, the Commission would use as a standard for "significantly viewed" status the standard defined in Section 76.5(i) of the Commission's rules. To

^{2/} Each applicant would be required to make the showing in its application, and applications would be accepted and acted upon on a first-come, first-served basis. See FNPRM, Para. 123. This would be fair to all stations in every market, because each licensee would learn of the possibility for television station combinations at the same time.

^{3/} The concept of "independent" media is explained on page 10, below.

qualify as a "competing media" under this test, a TV broadcast station would have to be significantly viewed in the county (or counties, if applicable) where the city(ies) of license of the two stations which are the subject of the proposed combination are situated.^{4/}

3) Low power television station ("LPTV") which are either (i) licensed to the same community as either of the television broadcast stations which are the subject of the proposed combination, or (ii) located in the county which includes the community of license of either of the stations which are the subject of the proposed combination, but (in such case) only if the LPTV facility meets the Commission's standards for "significantly

^{4/} Under Section 76.5(i) of the Rules, a network affiliated station is considered "significantly viewed" if it achieves a 25% net weekly circulation and 3% share of total viewing hours. For non-network affiliates, the standard is a 5% net weekly circulation and 2% share of viewing hours. Section 76.54 of the Rules requires that the station either (i) be shown as significantly viewed in the Commission's list of such stations in Appendix A to Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration of Cable Television Report and Order, FCC 72-530, 36 FCC 2d 326 (1972) based on audience surveys taken in 1970-1971; or (ii) be based on multiple countywide audience ratings achieved within the first three years of the station's operation, or on properly conducted community-wide audience ratings taken at any time. For current purposes, Texas Television suggests that stations be deemed significantly viewed based on either the Commission's 1970-1971 survey or on multiple countywide surveys taken at any time.

viewed" status as set forth in Section 76.5(i) of the Rules. If the television stations proposed for merger are licensed to communities in different counties, an LPTV station not licensed to one of those communities, in order to be considered as a "competing media," would be required to be significantly viewed in both counties.

4) Cable television, where the county (or counties) which includes the community of license of the television broadcast stations which are the subject of the proposed combination, has a home cable penetration rate which exceeds 25%.

5) Other video services (e.g., DBS, wireless cable, MMDS, etc.), where such video services provide effective competition to the proposed television broadcast station combination. For these purposes, such other providers would be deemed to provide "effective competition" if the multichannel video programming distributors (12 or more channels) provided service to at least 5% of potential subscribers (total) the DMA.

6) Local daily newspapers of general circulation published in the community of license of either of the stations which are the subject of the proposed merger. For these purposes, the Commission should use consider as a daily newspaper of general

circulation newspapers which meet the definition contained in Note 6 to Section 73.3555 of the Rules.

Under this "market-by-market" approach, an applicant which proposed to create a UHF/UHF combination would be required to demonstrate the existence of a specified number (to be determined by the Commission) of competing media which are completely independent of the entity (or entities) which would own the "jointly owned" television stations (i.e., the other media entities could not have any officers, directors, voting stockholders, or general partners in common with the entity(ies) owning the "jointly owned" television stations.) Subsequent changes in ownership structure which would eliminate this independence should not be allowed. Texas believes that where a proposed combination of two UHF television broadcast stations would leave a substantial number of other independent competing media, any diminishment in economic competition and viewpoint diversity which might result would be outweighed by the public interest gains which would result from efficiencies brought about by the joint operation of the stations.

III. If the Commission Decides Not To Allow the Ownership of Two UHF Television Stations in the Same Market, It Should Use the Grade A Contour of Television Stations To Determine the Existence of Prohibited Overlap.

In the FNPRM (at Para. 116), the Commission has tentatively proposed to change its rules to utilize the Grade A contours of television stations (rather than the Grade B contours^{5/}) for purposes of determining whether prohibited television broadcast station overlap exists. As the Commission noted (at Para. 117), the vast majority of the parties filing comments earlier in this proceeding have made the point that the area within a station's Grade A contour provides a "substantially more realistic and accurate measure of a station's core market" than does its Grade B contour, and hence the use of the Grade A contour is more sensible to use for overlap purposes. Although Texas strongly supports the view that the Commission should allow the ownership of UHF/UHF combinations in the same market regardless of contour overlap, at the very least the Commission should change Section 73.3555(b) of the Rules to provide for the use of the Grade A contour of television broadcast stations in determining the existence of prohibited overlap between television stations (UHF/UHF and UHF/VHF combinations) which are proposed for joint ownership.

^{5/} See Section 73.3555(b).

IV. The Commission Should "Grandfather" Television LMA's Which Are in Existence as of the Date the New Television LMA Rules Become Effective.

In the FNPRM (at Para. 138), the FCC tentatively proposes to treat LMA's for television stations in the same way as it treats LMA's for radio stations (i.e., the agreements must be filed with the FCC and must be placed in the station public file; the LMA's stations will be treated as an "owned" station for purposes of the local and national multiple ownership rules, etc.). Texas agrees with the Commission's tentative proposals on this basic point. However, it disagrees with the Commission's proposal to "grandfather" only those television LMA's entered into prior to "the adoption of this Notice, subject to renewability and transferability guidelines similar to those governing radio LMA's" (footnote omitted). Id.^{6/}

When the Commission considered the "grandfathering" issue in the context of radio station LMA's, it determined that LMA's entered into prior to the effective date of the applicable rules would be grandfathered (subject to certain conditions regarding

^{6/} Although the word "Notice" appears as a defined term in the FNPRM, and refers to the Commission's 1992 Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 7 FCC Rcd 4111, Texas assumes that this reference is in error, and that the reference to "this Notice" is in fact intended to refer to the FNPRM, which was adopted on December 15, 1994.

renewability, assignability, etc.) Memorandum Opinion and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, In re Revision of Radio Rules and Policies, MM Docket No. 91-140, 7 FCC Rcd 6387, at 6402 (1992), and Second Memorandum Opinion and Order, MM Docket No. 91-140, 9 FCC Rcd 7183, at 7192 (1994). Texas believes that the approach taken by the Commission in the context of radio station LMA's makes good sense, and that there is no good reason to distinguish between TV and radio LMA's by refusing to grandfather television station LMA's which are entered after the adoption of the FNPRM (December 15, 1994) but before the effective date of the applicable television LMA rules.

Moreover, Texas believes that the approach taken by the Commission in the radio LMA situation was fair, and that the proposed approach in the FNPRM to the television LMA situation is unfair. Texas believes that certain parties with informal contacts with the Commission's staff had advance notice that the FNPRM would be adopted on December 15, 1994, and that LMA's were rushed and entered immediately prior thereto, and in reliance on such information, in order to achieve "grandfathered" status. While Texas does not suggest that either such parties or any members of the Commission's staff acted improperly or unethically in this regard, Texas sees no reason why those members of the public who

took advantage of "insider contacts" should be allowed to benefit while those members of the public without such contacts confronted a fait accompli upon reading the FNPRM, because their right to enter a "grandfathered" television LMA was cut off without notice.

V. The Commission Should Eliminate the Current Prohibitions on Radio/Television Cross-Ownership.

Section 73.3555(a) of the Commission's rules limits the number and types of radio stations which may be owned by an single entity in a given market, and Section 73.3555(b) governs the ownership of television stations in a market. In addition, Section 73.3555(c) of the Rules currently prohibits an entity from owning both radio and television station(s) in any market (defined on the basis of overlapping coverage contours), although Note 7 states that the Commission will "waive" such rules in the case of a "failed station" or in the top 25 markets and where, after the consolidation, there will remain at least 30 separately owned broadcast licenses. As the long-time operator of television stations in three markets (one large market, and two middle-size market), Texas has considerable experience in the broadcasting field and is well aware of the competitive factors which criss-cross within the radio and television sides of the broadcasting industry. Based upon its experience, Texas believes that television

and radio services do not compete substantially the areas of local advertising, program delivery, and diversity of opinion in specific markets, and it believes that if the Commission were to allow the creation of radio/television combinations in the same market, it would not have a material adverse affect on marketplace competition.

Moreover, Texas firmly believes that the opportunities for enhanced public service by the creation of radio/television combinations goes beyond the mere reduction of administrative expenses (e.g., plant, utilities, administrative staff, etc.) which the Commission has recognized would be produced in the context of TV/TV combinations (see FNPRM, and discussion at Section III, above), and the potential of such funds for use by licensees in supporting their news and public service programming.

If television station owners were allowed to own radio stations in the same market, it would allow them to use the tremendous news-gathering and reporting talent and equipment already on hand and available to the television station owners to enhance the news capabilities and performance of their jointly-owned radio stations. Particularly in middle-size and modest-size markets, most radio stations are able to devote only minimal resources to news reporting and other local issue-oriented

discussions. Moreover, the cost of news gathering is so expensive that, for the most part, the all-news stations which are able to stand by themselves on a commercial basis are in the larger markets, where the modest share of the total available audience is sufficiently large to support this very expensive program format. In middle and smaller markets, the total audience which will support an all-news format is simply not of sufficient size to allow such a high-cost operation, and hence it is extremely difficult, if not completely impossible, for a licensee which might desire to do so to operate an all-news station on an independent, economically-viable, basis. However, if the owner of a television station was allowed to own local radio stations, it would be in a position to combine the news facilities of the stations, vastly increasing the amount and quality of news programming available to the radio station audience. In sum, the negligible additional cost of newsgathering for a radio station which was co-owned with a television station would greatly enhance the economic viability of all-news radio stations (particularly in middle and smaller markets), would increase the amount of information available in the radio medium, particularly the coverage of local news, and would therefore directly promote the public interest.

Accordingly, Texas believes that the Commission should eliminate the current radio/television cross ownership prohibition in Section 73.3555(c), and should rely solely on the Commission's local radio and the local television rules (as amended in this proceeding) to govern the extent to which a single entity is allowed to own more than a single broadcast facility in a given market.

Respectfully submitted

TEXAS TELEVISION, INC.

By: Robert B. Jacobi (s)

Robert B. Jacobi
Lawrence N. Cohn

Cohn and Marks
1333 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: 202/293-3860

Its Counsel

Dated: May 17, 1995